

While U.S.-built smaller cars are longer than the imported cars which you mention, it is also true that they are considerably shorter than our regular-size cars. Thus the overall length of a Chevy II is 182.9 inches, compared to 213.1 inches for the regular-size Chevrolet, a difference of 30.2 inches. Again, we would regard the length of our smaller cars, compared to that of the imports which you mention, a plus factor in over-the-highway driving.

Our approach has been to produce in this country the kinds of cars that we could offer at prices that would be attractive to customers and that would represent a highly competitive value for the dollar. We offer a wide variety of sizes, models, and body styles to meet the varying requirements and preferences of our customers.

As you may know, General Motors manufactures European-type smaller cars—the so-called 1-liter size—in England and Germany. These cars are competitive with the Volkswagen type of car with respect to size and performance. One of them, the Opel Kadett, is imported into this country, with a suggested retail price of \$1,655 for the two-door, four-cylinder sedan. The Opel Kadett is produced by Adam Opel, A.G. of Russelsheim, Germany, a wholly owned subsidiary of General Motors.

Again, I regret the delay in replying to your letter and trust that this information will be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

J. M. ROCHE.

The above letter clearly indicates that GM has no intention of producing, domestically, a car in the class of the popular European cars. GM's claim that its Chevy II is competitive cannot be accepted. The Chevy II is roughly 2 feet longer than the biggest of the three popular foreign economy cars. Its retail price is at best \$200 more than the most expensive competitor.

Finally, GM's exposition of the history of foreign penetration of the domestic market is somewhat misleading. It is true that it was lower in 1964 than in 1959, but the great drop was in 1961-62 when it dropped to 4.9 percent. Since then, foreign cars have started, once again, to increase their inroads on domestic sales.

The letter does refer to GM's manufacture of 1-liter cars in Europe through subsidiaries. But this aggravates our balance-of-payments problem rather than alleviating it.

STATEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE, AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA, UAW

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. LOVE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, support for legislation to establish a Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway continues to grow. I am pleased to add to the list of advocates the name of one of America's leading unions—the United Auto Workers. This great union has long been known for its concern for conservation problems and it has exerted real leadership in finding solutions.

Now, in a statement filed with the National Parks and Recreation Subcom-

mittees of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the UAW has added its important and respected voice to the call for Federal action to save the Hudson.

The UAW speaks with more than ordinary authority regarding the Hudson because of its concern for the many UAW members who live and work along the river's shores. I hope that all those concerned with the future of this great national asset will heed the UAW's excellent message:

The United Auto Workers urges immediate passage of Federal legislation to protect, develop, and restore the polluted Hudson River and its blighted shores.

The UAW, with 1,250,000 members throughout the United States and Canada, recognizes the importance of conserving the dwindling recreation areas around our great cities and industrial areas.

The Hudson River is a resource that must be protected and developed in the highest public interest. There must be appropriate industrial and commercial development which creates jobs and tax revenues to support the growing population. But, with proper planning, this can be balanced with development of the river's matchless scenic and recreational potential. The more than 40,000 members of the UAW in New York look for the kind of planning that will benefit all the people who use the river.

The State of New York has not provided the leadership necessary to achieve this goal. The evidence is clear that the State cannot now protect the river's assets without Federal guidance and assistance.

Through indifference and inaction, much has been lost along the Hudson. But there is still much to save. The Hudson can be a model for the new conservation described by President Johnson in his message on natural beauty. The UAW and its members believe that the Nation cannot afford to allow narrow political considerations to block such action.

We urge that the National Parks and Recreation Subcommittee and the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee report favorably on legislation that will enable the Federal Government to act to save the Hudson. We urge that Congress pass such legislation now.

FRANKLIN WALLICK,

Washington Legislative Representative.

AMENDING FEDERAL EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION ACT

(Mr. HATHAWAY (at the request of Mr. LOVE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I introduce today a bill amending the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. The following is an explanation of this bill:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

INTRODUCTION

This bill proposes improvements in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act which move toward an updating of workmen's compensation protection for Federal employees and their survivors to the basis the act is intended to furnish. The major deficiency of the Compensation Act, which the bill would supplement, is an increased maximum compensation limit, to take the place of the existing limit which was set in 1949. At that time the top salary for Presidential

appointees was \$15,000 a year and for classified employees \$10,330. Parallel salaries are now \$35,000 and \$24,500.

The maximum monthly compensation would be increased by this bill from \$525 to \$685 a month, and the minimum from \$180 to \$210.

Under the bill present beneficiaries of the act are authorized to receive an increase in their benefits commensurate with the annual average percentage change in the Consumer Price Index since the year in which the benefit was awarded, offset by any increases authorized by Congress since the award.

In survivor cases, the bill authorizes the continuation of benefits for educational purposes to unmarried children after the age of 18 up to age 23. The bill also permits these payments up to age 23 to children who became 18 before the effective date of the proposed act.

IMPROVEMENTS IN BENEFITS

Increase of present maximum and minimum compensation

The present dollar maximum of \$525 a month was established in 1949. Between 1949 and 1964 Government earnings have increased 80 percent and over this period the Consumer Price Index shows an increase of 31 percent. Manifestly, the maximum of \$525 does not carry out the intent of the act that employees generally may receive up to 75 percent of their basic compensation if they are totally disabled. This proposal alleviates this situation by increasing the present dollar maximum to \$686 a month, a figure which takes into account the increase in the Consumer Price Index. This would permit all employees making \$10,960 (the equivalent of a GS-11, step 8 or a GS-12, step 3) or less, to receive benefits up to the 75 percent maximum of basic monthly compensation which the act authorizes. Available information indicates that 93 percent of all Federal workers are in this category.

The Compensation Act now provides a minimum compensation amount of \$180 per month and that totally disabled employees whose monthly pay is less than this amount shall be entitled to their full pay. The bill would increase the minimum amount to \$210 a month, approximately the same income which would be earned in a 40-hour workweek at the minimum wage rate of \$1.25 an hour required under the Fair Labor Standards Act. The minimum in the Compensation Act was increased in 1960 to the present amount. With today's living costs, it is believed that employees making \$210 a month or less would not be able to subsist on 75 percent of their earnings and that, therefore, their entire earnings should be paid during total disability. Only a few thousand blue collar employees fall within a wage bracket so low they would be affected by this provision. The minimum rate for white-collar employees under the Classification Act—employees in GS-1, step 1, receive \$3,385, or approximately \$280 a month.

The bill also amends section 6(a)(1) to increase from \$420 to \$546 the limit upon the amount of an employee's basic pay which may be considered in computing additional compensation because of dependents.

Increase of compensation under previous awards

The last increase authorized for previously adjudicated compensation awards was for injuries occurring prior to January 1, 1958. As a matter of equity, the bill authorizes an increase in previous awards on a basis related to the increased cost of living. These awards are to be adjusted on the basis of the annual average change in the Consumer Price Index as determined by the Secretary, since the award was made, offset by any increase authorized by Congress since the award adjudication.

Authority to continue benefits on account of surviving children for school attendance

The bill also permits in survivor cases, the continuation of benefits to unmarried children after the age of 18 to permit completion on a full-time basis of their program of education at an educational institution as such terms are defined by the Secretary. At present, payment of these benefits is terminated at age 18 unless the beneficiaries are disabled. This age occurs when most children are finishing high school, many of whom may wish to enter college. The increased family financial need could be alleviated and education encouraged if the survivor payment continues until such time as the child could normally finish college (i.e., the age of 23).

To prevent inequities with respect to children who become 18 before the effective date of this act and who might otherwise qualify for the continuation of benefits, the bill authorizes payment of compensation on their account until the age of 23 or the completion of their education, whichever is earlier. This amendment would also bring the Compensation Act in line with a similar program of the Veterans' Administration for continuation of benefits of war orphans.

The continuation of compensation for educational reasons is not only dictated by principles of justice and equity, but is socially and economically desirable in our society which regards the education of offspring as one of the breadwinner's primary responsibilities.

Improvement in administrative provisions

A technical amendment is proposed to transfer a substantive item from the Department of Labor Annual Appropriations Act to the Compensation Act. For many years, the Appropriations Acts of the Department have provided that the rulemaking authority of the Secretary of Labor under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act be construed to include the authority to establish the nature and extent of proofs and evidence required in compensation claims of certain noncitizens and nonresident employees employed outside the United States.

Technical provisions

The bill also makes clear that it applies only to persons who are employees under the act; that no reduction in compensation by reason of Consumer Price Index changes is authorized; that no previous compensation award shall be increased by more than this change; and that all payments authorized pursuant to the bill will be on a prospective basis.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the week of August 30, on account of attending U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, as an advisor for the U.S. House of Representatives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SIKES in five instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CLEVINGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. HAYS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARSH immediately following House adoption of House Joint Resolution 598.

Mr. MURPHY immediately following the remarks of Mr. MARSH.

Mr. LANDRUM and to include an address on "The Changing Role of Libraries," in spite of the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$245.

Mr. DONOVUE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUINN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole.

(Mr. BELLI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks immediately following the remarks of Mrs. MAY in general debate.)

Mr. DANIELS (at the request of Mrs. GREEN of Oregon) prior to the vote on H.R. 9567, and immediately after the remarks of Mr. GIBBONS.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LAIRD in two instances.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama in two instances.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. CEDERBERG.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mrs. MAY.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. VIVIAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.

Mr. DIGGS.

Mr. MARSH in two instances.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa.

Mr. WAGGONER.

Mr. BANDSTRA in two instances.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FUQUA in two instances.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER in two instances.

Mr. STALBAUM.

Mr. MCVICKER.

Mr. DONOVUE.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia in two instances.

Mr. KIRWAN in two instances.

Mr. KING of Utah.

Mr. PEPPEL.

Mr. ABERNETHY in two instances.

Mr. ICHORI.

Mr. TUNNEY.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. MILLER in five instances.

Mr. SICKLES.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1474. An act to create a bipartisan commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of

the Government; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. 1811. An act to transfer certain functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to certain other agencies of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1715. An act to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8639. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8639. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, August 30, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1511. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed new obligatory authority for various agencies and for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1966 (H. Doc. No. 278); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1512. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Palmetto Bend project, Texas, pursuant to section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 279); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

1513. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to clarify the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in respect of consolidation of certain proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mississippi from the sea, and it was from Ship Island that the first French settlement on the Gulf Coast was established at the present site of Ocean Springs, where Fort Maurepas was constructed.

One hundred and fifteen years after Iberville dropped anchor in the shelter of Ship Island, the British expedition against New Orleans in 1814 used Ship Island as a staging area for the campaign. The naval battle of December 14, 1814, when five little American gunboats under Lt. Catesby Jones valiantly opposed a whole fleet of British armed barges, was fought in the waters between Ship Island and Bay St. Louis.

And nearly half a century after the British, defeated at New Orleans on January 8, 1815, had retreated to their warships and transports at Ship Island and sailed away, another invasion was launched at Ship Island.

For a while in 1861, Confederate Forces occupied Ship Island and a halfhearted attempt at fortifying it was begun, but General Twiggs, then in command in New Orleans, ordered Ship Island evacuated. Accordingly, with little or no opposition, Ship Island was occupied by Federal troops in the fall of 1861. Farragut's fleet used it as a supply and repair base for his attack on Forts Jackson and St. Philip in April 1862, the passing of which by the Union warships bespoke the fall of New Orleans. And Gen. Ben Butler's occupation troops were assembled at Ship Island, before boarding transports to follow in Farragut's wake to New Orleans.

The War Department authorized construction of a fort on the western end of Ship Island in 1866, but by 1861, when Confederates seized it, the walls had been built to only a height of 6 feet.

When the Federals occupied Ship Island in September 1861, the name Fort Massachusetts was bestowed upon the unfinished works, probably because the warship *Massachusetts* had supplied the men to take possession of it. However, according to the researches of Jim Stevens, the fort was never officially named Massachusetts.

"Men in writing home seem to have given it that name themselves. When the war correspondents accompanying Brig. Gen. Phelps landed with his New England Brigade December 4, they sent their news story to Boston and New York headed 'Fort Massachusetts, Ship Island.' *Harpers Weekly*, in its January 4, 1862 issue, uses the name prominently and thus a label was unofficially perpetuated."

After the Civil War, Fort Massachusetts was completed in 1872 and Ship Island served as a U.S. Quarantine Station and a customs post in the 1880's. Today, the old fort on Ship Island attracts 40,000 visitors a year.

"Historically speaking, Ship Island is one of the most frequently mentioned islands of the United States," declares Jim Stevens. "Whether for military invasion or peaceful commerce, it has made a definite impact on the country's history. Geographically, Ship Island is primarily useful today as a seasonal seashore playground. Its seven to eight miles of Gulf of Mexico shoreline has a constant roaring surf. Ship Island can bring much happiness to millions of Americans."

Personally, I share Jim Stevens' enthusiasm for the development of Ship Island. For years, I wondered why the State of Mississippi didn't exploit it for tourists. Now, with a bill in Congress to make it a national historical seashore, Ship Island could, at long last, come into its own as a recreational area.

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. WELTNER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MULTER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

LARRY O'BRIEN

(Mr. GILBERT (at the request of Mr. WELTNER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the President on his selection of Lawrence F. O'Brien to be Postmaster General of the United States. Although he served as Postmaster General only a short time, Mr. Gronouski has done an outstanding job, and I know that Larry O'Brien will follow his efficient and capable standards.

Larry is well known to us in Congress, having served as legislative liaison officer for both President Kennedy and President Johnson. He is well liked on Capitol Hill where he has been of tremendous assistance to all of us. I am proud of my warm and close association with this friendly, able man from Massachusetts. He is a man of great personal charm and character, with unmatched knowledge and understanding of both the legislative and executive branch of our Government, and he enjoys the high regard of both. As Postmaster General, he brings to a demanding position the ability and talent that will make him a great Postmaster General.

I extend to my good friend, Larry O'Brien, my hearty congratulations and best wishes.

MIKE MANSFIELD

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana (at the request of Mr. WELTNER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have long admired and respected our senior Senator from Montana, Mr. MIKE MANSFIELD, and would like to bring to the attention of the Members the warm and revealing portrait of our distinguished majority leader published in today's *New York Times*.

[From the *New York Times*, Sept. 2, 1965]

OUTSPOKEN SENATE CHIEF: MIKE MANSFIELD
 WASHINGTON, September 1.—At the conclusion of his remarks at the opening Senate Democratic caucus last January 4, Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD dealt with the delicate question of what Members owed to the President and to their own conscience in the field of foreign policy.

"I would hope that Democratic Members, indeed all Senators," he said, "would bear in mind at all times the great burdens which the President carries for all of us in these decisions of foreign policy. I would hope and expect that we will give him every support, by word and vote, which can, in good conscience, be given."

"And I would hope that Members qualified in questions of foreign policy would not hesitate, after careful study, to speak out on them."

"Contributions have been made, from time to time, by Members of the Senate to the more effective formulation and conduct of our foreign relations. And clearly we are at a stage now in world developments when prudent contributions of thought and idea can be very useful."

It was in this spirit that Mr. MANSFIELD made his speech today pointing out that both sides in Vietnam were setting certain conditions on a negotiated settlement. It so happened that Mr. MANSFIELD's idea coincided with those of the President and therefore the President welcomed the speech.

HIS IDEA OF HIS TASK

But Mr. MANSFIELD would have made the speech whether or not it had the President's approval. He has always believed it was possible, though admittedly difficult, for him to function as the administration's leader, to represent the President's views to the Senate and still to be able to voice his own views as Senator from Montana.

Those views have not always been welcomed at the White House. For example, Mr. MANSFIELD aroused considerable dismay there when, on June 14, 1961, he suggested that all Berlin be made a free city under international guarantees and protection—the guarantees to be given by both the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Warsaw Pact countries and access to be assured by international peace teams.

Again Mr. MANSFIELD believed the Kennedy administration had blundered badly in withdrawing support for the regime of Premier Ngo Dinh Diem, in Vietnam. He said so at the time and has continued to say so.

The Senator freely conceded the mistakes and deficiencies of Premier Diem and he deplored the influence exerted on him by his brother and sister-in-law, Ngo Dinh Nhu, and his wife. Nevertheless, he maintained that the Diem regime offered the only hope of a reasonably viable, dependable government.

Whether or not Mr. MANSFIELD's ideas on Vietnam have found acceptance at the White House, he has earned his credentials as a commentator worthy of respect.

For 10 years before election to the House of Representatives in 1942, he was a professor of Far Eastern affairs at Montana State University. Beginning in 1953, he has made five trips to Vietnam. He was in Hanoi in the final days of the evacuation of the French forces. In 1959 he conducted a study of U.S. foreign aid in South Vietnam.

HE CONFERS ALMOST DAILY

Mr. MANSFIELD said today that he conferred almost daily with President Johnson on Vietnam. It is generally believed here that he has had some influence on the President's thinking.

For example, there is reason to believe that the President's speech at Johns Hopkins University last April in which he offered unconditional negotiations was partly the result of conversations with Senator MANSFIELD and Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, in which they expressed their fears of expansion of the war.

It is also believed that Mr. MANSFIELD's cautionary views reinforced the President's reluctance to call up Reserves.

The rise of MIKE MANSFIELD is a remarkable story. He was born March 16, 1903, at 98 Perry Street in Greenwich Village, N.Y. When he was three, his parents moved to Montana. At 14 he left home and enlisted—after some dissembling about his age—in the Navy in World War I. He served in the Navy for 2 years, then shifted to the Army in 1919–20, and finally served as a Marine in China from 1920 to 1922.

Returning home, he worked in the mines from 1922 to 1930, earning the money to support himself while he went to high school. In 1931 he married Maureen Hayes of Butte, a schoolteacher, who was determined that he was going to have an education. He spent a year in the Montana School of Mines and 4 years at Montana State, where he took his bachelor's degree in 1933.

OUT OF WORK IN DEPRESSION

His master's degree from Montana State in 1934 was a matter of necessity. He applied for

a high school teaching position in two small Montana towns and was turned down because he was a Roman Catholic. He was out of a job in the height of the depression.

A professor at Montana State offered him a trifling stipend as an assistant. It was the only thing available. His wife cashed in her insurance and went to work, and he got his master's degree.

From 1933 to 1943 he taught Latin-American and Far Eastern studies at Montana University. In 1942 he was elected to Congress. After five terms in the House, he was elected to the Senate in 1952. He was reelected with ease in 1958 and 1964.

In 1957 Lyndon B. Johnson, then the majority leader, made Mr. MANSFIELD his whip, or assistant leader. When Mr. Johnson became Vice President, the Democratic Senate conference elevated Mr. MANSFIELD to the leadership. He was the one man acceptable to the southerners and the northern liberals.

A REMARKABLE CONTRAST

No two men could be more different in character, in style and in conduct than the ebullient, flamboyant Texan and the quiet, ascetic-looking scholar from Montana.

Lyndon Johnson dominated the Senate. He cajoled and flattered, browbeat and insinuated, wheeled and dealed. He would let days go by without trying to press the Senate's business and then suddenly keep the Senate in grueling night sessions until weary Senators were prepared to do his will. He rarely confided his strategy to his colleagues, even to his assistant leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD has no such talents and does not aspire to them. He is entirely without wile or guile. He has no strategy and he has no secrets.

During the long struggle over the civil rights bill last year, he gave Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, leader of the southern opposition, advance notice of every move he would make.

Mr. MANSFIELD is also selfless to the point of shunning credit. He even gladly assigned it to Senator EVERETT M. DIRksen, of Illinois, the Republican leader, as he did on the passage of the treaty limiting nuclear tests, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the voting rights bill this year.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENTS

(Mr. O'HARA of Michigan (at the request of Mr. WELTNER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. Last week, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY) introduced H.R. 10721, a bill embodying the administration's proposals for amendment of the same act. There are no areas of direct conflict between the two bills, and it is my hope that both can be considered by the House at an early date.

H.R. 10721 is directed primarily at increasing benefits and at correcting certain substantive inequities in the present act. My own bill, H.R. 10865, also addresses itself to certain substantive problems, and also to some procedural shortcomings. Under the present act, workmen's compensation for Federal civil employees is awarded, following the provisions of the act, by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, acting for the Secretary of Labor, on the basis of evi-

dence submitted by the employee or collected from other sources by the Bureau.

There is no hearing procedure, there is no judicial review of the Bureau's decision. There is an Appeals Board, but it cannot take new evidence, and, in spite of the obvious effort made by the Bureau and the Board to give every claimant equitable treatment, the fact remains that the claimant's case has to be developed before the Bureau, and, at that point there is no hearing procedure. I might mention that the Federal Employees' Compensation Act is unique among the 54 Federal and State workmen's compensation programs in not allowing for hearings or judicial review. H.R. 10865 would remedy this lack.

H.R. 10865 would also move to meet other defects in the act. As it now reads, for example, if a Federal watch repairman should suffer a partial loss of use of his right hand and suffer some other major impairment not specifically covered in the schedule of injuries, he can be compensated for a loss of wage-earning capacity, but not for the loss of his hand. But if he only sustains a partial loss of use of his hand—which in such an example still might totally deprive him of his trade skills—he can be compensated for that loss, but not for the permanent loss of wage-earning capacity. This, Mr. Speaker, makes very little sense no matter how you think about it. My bill would allow compensation for loss of earning capacity in either case.

Under the law as it now reads, a widow can receive death benefits until her own death or her remarriage. Marriage halts benefits, while more informal arrangements allow the compensation to keep coming in. My bill provides for a lump sum payment upon remarriage, thus removing the act's current, and I am sure unintentional, premium upon illegal cohabitation.

Hearings on FECA amendments are scheduled, Mr. Speaker, before the Select Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor. The hearings are expected to begin on September 9. I hope these hearings will provide an opportunity for a thorough review of the Federal Employees Compensation Act.

NEW JERSEYAN NOMINATED FOR EPISCOPAL SOCIETY FOR CULTURAL AND RACIAL UNITY NATIONAL BOARD

(Mr. KREBS (at the request of Mr. WELTNER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, the Episcopal Churches in the congressional district which I have the privilege to represent have been among the leaders in constructive civil rights work. The two bishops of the Episcopal Church of the Newark diocese are constituents of mine, as they live in Montclair, N.J. I am, therefore, delighted that one of my constituents, Mr. Frederick H. Sontag also of Montclair, N.J., has been nominated to represent the States of New Jersey and New York in particular and the east coast

in general on the national board of directors of the Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity.

Mr. Sontag has been active in the civil rights field since the 1940's and worked on behalf of the civil rights bills of 1957, 1962 and 1964. Mr. Sontag was the coordinator chosen by prelates of the major faiths who prepared the material answering the false and malicious charges that churchmen—Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and Jewish—engaged in drunkenness and sex orgies during the Selma-Montgomery march.

I was one of the first to take the floor of this House, Mr. Speaker, and to join other responsible members of this body in challenging these irresponsible and inaccurate charges as they were twice expressed by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKENSON). The Essex County clergy who participated in the Alabama march have outstanding reputations in their ministry and have my confidence that they conducted themselves in strict accord with the dictates of their faith. Moreover, it is noteworthy that there has been silence on the part of the gentleman from Alabama since the smears directed at the clergy and devoted church people were issued and fully rebutted on the floor of this House.

A distinguished democratic layman, Mr. Malcolm E. Peabody, Jr., of Cambridge, Mass., is the president of the Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity. He is the brother of the former Democratic Governor of Massachusetts and the son of Bishop and Mrs. Malcolm E. Peabody of the Episcopal Church. Mrs. Peabody won the affection and respect of many of us when she went to St. Augustine, Fla., to fight for civil rights with the wife of one of the Episcopal Negro bishops and both good ladies were promptly arrested.

A group of New Jersey priests and laymen and laywomen will be going to Jackson, Miss., to attend the fifth annual meeting of ESCRU on September 9-13. In view of the tragic assassination of Jonathan Myrick Daniels, the Selma-based fieldworker for ESCRU, in Hayneville, Ala., on August 20, it is clear that the eyes of many people interested in advancing the cause of civil rights will be focused on the work of the priests and laymen and laywomen of ESCRU. Building a constructive program to help insure human and civil rights for all our people will be one thing that can be done at this meeting, and which will be in some small measure a fitting memorial to the late Jonathan Daniels.

According to the Montclair Times, Mr. Sontag took a constructive part in the New Jersey Conference on Preserving the Democratic Process—An Examination of the Tactics and Implications of Extremism, as part of the New Jersey Episcopal delegation.

ESCRU fielded over 500 priests and laymen as participants during the Selma and Montgomery march. This Episcopal group of dedicated bishops, priests, and lay people has been in the forefront in fighting for civil rights throughout this country during the last 5 years. Although Jonathan Daniels is the first